

when we go from a fourth to a half cent. It would make me a great deal more comfortable supporting the bill with this amendment on it. I do not think even the wheat growers would think that we had actually sold them out by putting this amendment on because they'll undoubtedly, nearly double their funds by doubling the rate and leaving the opt out provision. I think the average farmer that is raising wheat across this state would desire to have the opt out provision in it. We are taking that tax, if we don't put an opt out provision, whether the farmer wants it or not. If it comes to a point that the government loan price is setting the price of wheat, actually it's just reducing his net dollar. If we are not affecting this marketing enough to substantially effect the price. I do have some reservations on all of these programs when we work on two routes, and one is marketing to dispose of more product, and then some funds trickle back into research to develop more product--new varieties of wheat. I think this is unfair to use the farmers check-off dollar in those certain areas, although, in general terms I support the wheat growers use of this money. But I think these are contradictory terms. At best, I think the farmers ought to have this opt out provision. I don't think it will hurt the wheat grower substantially. It puts a good check and balance system in where the farmer can cast his vote against the management of it by asking for that refund in any amount in excess of \$7. I think, for the individual farmers you'll look at, the vast majority would support this amendment. Certainly the association of wheat growers would not, they're in the center of the management of the program. But I think if we want to go back down to grassroots and see what the farmers of the state want, I think you'll vote for the amendment. If you want to go for what the organization wants, we may not. I really think it just puts the organization on its toes to provide a good, responsible program back to the farmers. I support the amendment. I do not feel strongly that it is a bad bill either way. I think we ought to look to the farmers, rather than the organization. Thank you.

PRESIDENT: Senator Carsten.

SENATOR CARSTEN: Mr. President, members of the Legislature. I do not rise to oppose the amendment. I think that the agriculture industry, in particular this wheat industry, does need some further development as far as the foreign markets are concerned, as well as the research in Nebraska. I want to correct one thing that Senator Lewis said. I believe that if he would go back to the testimony that was offered at the hearing that the Farm Bureau does not oppose a check-off. The concern that Farm Bureau has is the accountability of the expenditures of those monies that that Commission has. Further I believe that the Agricultural Committee and the Appropriations Committee conducted an interim study, and had asked that an accountability or a report from the Commission be given back in 1975. I would like to ask Senator Bereuter or one of the members of the Appropriations Committee if they have ever yet received a report upon that request.

PRESIDENT: Senator Koch. Oh, Senator Bereuter, I'm sorry.

SENATOR BEREUTER: I'm sorry, Senator Carsten, which report was it? I missed that.